

REMARKS

In this paper, claim 1 is currently amended, and claims 23-25 have been added. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-21 and 23-25 are pending, and claims 6, 15 and 22 have been canceled.

Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as not satisfying the written description requirement. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that at least a majority of the disk brake rotor apparatus between outermost lateral side surfaces at correspondingly same radial and circumferential locations thereof is free of voids. In other words, voids are absent between correspondingly facing surfaces of the first and second rotor members for a majority of the disk brake rotor apparatus. While Fig. 7 shows a cross section of a part of the disk brake rotor apparatus, Figs. 6A and 6B show the complete rotor members. When the fixing holes (90A) and (91D) are lined up during manufacture, all of the openings align with each other, so the remaining portions will be free of voids between their correspondingly facing surfaces. Thus, Figs. 6A and 6B support the claimed subject matter.

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Claim 13 has been amended to properly recite the relation of the fixing components to the fasteners.

Claims 1-5 and 7-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Otomo (JP 2,679,162) in view of Shima, et al (JP 56-134,089). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Otomo discloses a disk brake rotor (4) comprising a first rotor member (1) disposed between a pair of second rotor members (2). A plurality of attaching holes (5) are formed through disk brake rotor (4), and a cylindrical collar (7) is fitted in each attaching hole (5). A fastener (9) extends through each collar (7) to mount disk brake rotor (4) to a mounting member (not shown). Each collar (7) extends from the external side surface of one second rotor member (2) to the opposite external side surface of the other second rotor member (2). As a result, all pressing forces of fastener (9) are communicated through collar (7), so rotor members (1) and (2) are not pressed towards each other

by the fastener and the hub mounting member to prevent delamination of the first rotor member and the first second rotor member from each other.

The office action states that Otomo's fasteners (9) are capable of pressing against the laminate to prevent delamination of the rotor. However, there is no basis to conclude that either the collars (7) or the fasteners (9) provide a pressing force that presses the rotor members *toward each other*. The collars (7) or fasteners (9) may resist laterally outward force from the outermost rotor member (2) in the event of delamination, but that is not the same as actually pressing the rotor members *toward* each other. Neither Otomo nor Shima disclose or suggest the presently claimed subject matter.

Claims 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Otomo in view of Shima, et al and Seymour (US 6,343,675). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons noted above.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE
P.O. Box 69
Klamath River, California 96050
(530) 465-2430